

1
2
3
4 PAUL SOMERS,
5 Plaintiff,
6 v.
7 DIGITAL REALTY TRUST INC, et al.,
8 Defendants.

9 Case No. [14-cv-05180-EMC](#)
10
11

**12 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
13 REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION
14 OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
15 DISCOVERY ORDERS**

16 Docket Nos. 249, 253, 254

17 Between July 26 and August 21, Plaintiff Paul Somers filed six motions with the Court.
18 The motions are:

19 (1) Docket No. 247: First MOTION for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply as to
20 246 Order on Motion for Protective Order, 245 Order on Discovery Letter Brief
21 (2) Docket No. 248: First MOTION for Reconsideration re 246 Order on Motion for
22 Protective Order Requesting Reconsideration of Magistrate Judge's Non-Dispositive
23 Pretrial Order
24 (3) Docket No. 249: First MOTION for Reconsideration of Magistrate Judge's Non-
25 Dispositive Pretrial Order re 246 Motion for Protective Order
26 (4) Docket No. 251: First MOTION for Special Relief from Stay to Hear Motion for Leave
27 of Stay to Request Approval To Exceed Page Limits and for Further Extension of Time
28 to Allow Plaintiff to File Motion for Relief of Non-Dispositive Pretrial Order of
Magistrate Judge
(5) Docket No. 253: MOTION for Reconsideration re 245 Order on Discovery Letter Brief
(6) Docket No. 254: Second MOTION for Extension of Time to File Due to New
Information Regarding Defendant's Conduct Affecting Recent Motion

The Court previously granted Motions 1 (Docket No. 247) and 4 (Docket No. 251). *See*
Docket No. 252. The Court finds Motion 6 (Docket No. 254), requesting still more time to file yet

1 another motion that has already been briefed, is not supported by good cause and is therefore
2 **DENIED.**¹ Motion 3 (Docket No. 249) replaced Motion 2 (Docket No. 248) on the docket. The
3 Court now considers Motions 3 (Docket No. 249) and 5 (Docket No. 253) and, for the reasons
4 below, **DENIES** both motions.

5 A. Reconsideration of July 11 and July 13 Pretrial Orders

6 Motions 3 and 5 respectively concern two of the Magistrate Judge's orders: a July 11, 2017
7 order concerning several discovery disputes between the parties (Docket No. 245) and a July 13,
8 2017 protective order barring Plaintiff from communicating with certain witnesses outside of
9 formal judicial process (Docket No. 247).

10 A district judge "may reconsider any pretrial matter" determined by a magistrate judge
11 "where it has been shown that the magistrate judge's order is clearly erroneous or contrary to
12 law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). Local rules require the movant to "specifically identify the
13 portion of the Magistrate Judge's order to which objection is made and the reasons and authority
14 therefor." Local C.R. 72-2. The request should specify "the action requested and the reasons
15 supporting the motion." *Id.*

16 With respect to his challenge to Judge Westmore's order on several outstanding discovery
17 disputes, *see* Docket No. 245, Plaintiff has utterly failed to specify the basis for his objections.
18 Rather, on pages 9 and 10 of the motion, he simply enumerates the discovery disputes he disagrees
19 with, without explaining why the Magistrate Judge's holding was "clearly erroneous or contrary to
20 law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). *See* Docket No. 253 at 9-10. As a preliminary matter, a number
21 of issues Plaintiff objects to have nothing to do with the July 11, 2017 Order; rather, they pertain
22

23 ¹ The Court has attempted to give Plaintiff every chance to present his arguments, but he has
24 abused the opportunity. For example, Plaintiff requested leave to file a late 13-page motion (eight
25 pages in excess of the local rules) regarding Judge Westmore's discovery order because "there is a
26 fair amount of detail to unwind and research to be done." *See* Docket No. 251. The Court granted
27 the request. *See* Docket No. 252. Plaintiff's objections took no more than 1 page, at the end of
28 the motion; the remaining ten pages were largely devoted to immaterial procedural background,
including lengthy discussion of issues that are not pertinent to the recent discovery dispute or have
already been resolved by the Court. *See* Docket No. 253. On August 21, Somers filed yet another
motion "requesting a further extension to file the Declaration and supplemental brief." *See* Docket
No. 254 at 4. However, Somers has already received two extensions, and has already filed several
briefs and a declaration. The Court does not find good cause to grant the request; it is hereby
DENIED.

1 to a March 15, 2017 order for which Plaintiff has already sought, and been denied,
2 reconsideration. *See* Docket Nos. 201, 218. Other objections, such as “general objections to
3 discovery letter process,” are not comprehensible. *See* Docket No. 253 at 9. Notwithstanding
4 Plaintiff’s failure to specify the basis for his remaining objections, the Court has reviewed the
5 Magistrate Judge’s order and finds no basis to disturb it. Thus, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s
6 motion for reconsideration of the July 11, 2017 order. *See* Docket No. 253.

7 Plaintiff also challenges Judge Westmore’s issuance of a protective order that states:

8 Plaintiff shall not contact Ms. Schubert in connection with any
9 matter relating to this case except through formal judicial process.
10 Plaintiff is also directed not to threaten any disclosed witnesses,
11 and/or otherwise engage in intimidating or abusive communications
12 with such individuals. This order does not prevent Plaintiff from
reaching out to those disclosed witnesses as part of the judicial
process, so long as Plaintiff is civil and refrains from personal
attacks and threats.

13 Docket No. 246 at 3-4. Contrary to Plaintiff’s assertion, *see* Docket No. 249 at 3, Judge
14 Westmore explained precisely what actions she relied on to determine a protective order was
15 necessary: Plaintiff’s e-mail to Ms. Schubert, a former employee of Defendants, which included
16 several abusive comments, like blaming Ms. Schubert for the damage he has suffered, losing his
17 father to suicide, and his inability to care for his ill mother. *See* Docket No. 246 at 3 (citing
18 Schubert Decl., Exh. A, Docket No. 242-1). Plaintiff then accused Ms. Schubert of defamation,
19 writing, “[w]hy did you write those false statements? Did you want to get even with the universe
20 because you can’t give birth? Is your marriage still so miserable you wished to spread it around
21 your sadness [sic]?” *Id.* Ms. Schubert was, of course, upset, and expressed a desire not to be
22 contacted by Plaintiff again. *See* Schubert Decl. ¶ 4.

23 The Court finds that Judge Westmore’s protective order has ample evidentiary and legal
24 support. In addition to the authorities Judge Westmore has cited, “a court has the inherent power
25 to protect witnesses.” *Wheeler v. U.S.*, 640 F.2d 1116, 1123 (9th Cir. 1981). This power “stems
26 from the indisputably broad powers of the trial judge to ensure the orderly and expeditious
27 progress of a trial,” and the “broad discretion to protect the administration of justice from abuses,
28 oppression and injustice.” *Id.* (citations and quotations omitted). Plaintiff’s suggestion that a

1 finding of bad faith is required is meritless, as such orders do not require that finding. Docket No.
2 249 at 4. Even if they did, the Court would have no trouble inferring bad faith from an abusive e-
3 mail that specifically attacks Ms. Schubert for her testimony in this litigation and threatens her
4 with a defamation lawsuit. Plaintiff has identified no basis demonstrating Judge Westmore's order
5 was "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A).² Moreover, the order does
6 not prejudice his discovery efforts because he still has the ability to use formal judicial process to
7 obtain whatever evidence he may need. Accordingly, this Court **DENIES** his motion for re-
8 consideration of the protective order. *See* Docket No. 246.

9 In light of Plaintiff's abuse of the litigation process, *see supra* n.1, Plaintiff is ordered not
10 to file additional motions or declarations in connection with the July 11 and July 13, 2017
11 protective order and discovery order, or other orders of the Magistrate Judge for which he has
12 already sought review.

13 This order disposes of Docket Nos. 249, 253, and 254. The Court previously resolved
14 Docket Nos. 247 and 251.

15
16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17
18 Dated: August 22, 2017



19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge

² Plaintiff also appears to dispute a July 8, 2016 Order, *see* Docket No. 110, but this Court has
already reviewed that order, sustaining it in part and overruling it in part, *see* Docket No. 116. *See*
Docket No. 249 at 2-3.